



July 11, 2016 | 9:00 – 11:30 am
10 Park Plaza | Conference rooms 5 and 6
(directly behind the security desk on the 2nd floor)

Action Items:

- CTPS: Follow up on questions Working Group members raised from existing conditions and demographics presentations
- CBI: Follow up with
 - Jen Slesinger at MassDOT who is working on Focus40 regarding the project's public engagement efforts
 - Tad Read at the BRA who is interested in contributing to the public engagement efforts of the project, as well as others who may be interested

Meeting Discussion:

June meeting follow-up:

The group approved the draft June Meeting Summary.

In following up on previous actions items, Mr. Field reminded the group to submit policy, TDM, or infrastructure component ideas to CBI and CTPS by July 31. Mr. Bourassa reported that MAPC had reached out to neighboring municipalities at the planning level, and clarified that executive-level contact to neighboring municipalities should come from MassDOT rather than from MAPC.

Existing conditions¹:

- *Key Corridors:*

Mr. Abbott presented an analysis of the existing transportation conditions in the focus and impact analysis areas of the study, examining all modes of transportation.

Mr. Abbott presented analysis of traffic patterns for four key corridors: Interstate 93 and Routes 16, 28, and 99, using an INRIX vehicle dataset from 2012. CTPS reported that they were taking steps to secure new data during the course of fall 2016.

Mr. Monty raised the point that the new tolls on the Tobin Bridge will become an existing condition during the course of the Group's work, but they will not be included in this analysis of existing conditions. Mr. Abbott responded that because data from spring 2017 would be needed to get reliable information on conditions, it might not be possible

¹ For more details of CTPS' presentations on existing conditions and demographic growth projections, see slides of presentations.

to include in the existing conditions analysis, but that it would be included in the scenario modeling.

- *MBTA:*

Mr. Abbott's presentation on the MBTA included analysis of buses and the Green, Orange, Blue, and Commuter lines.

- *Traffic Conditions:*

Mr. Abbott discussed the existing traffic conditions in the study area, which contains 56 intersections. 53 intersections have been analyzed so far using Synchro software, and CTPS is awaiting more data for the remaining three.

The group clarified that letter grades to discuss levels of service (i.e. A, B, C, D, F) are preferable to more descriptive or subjective terms, such as "acceptable," which are ambiguous.

The group acknowledged the need to balance realistic expectations for levels of service that can be achieved in congested areas with a commitment to address bad levels of service to the greatest extent possible. Mr. Draisen pointed out the need to account for the deleterious affects of traffic congestion not only on people who are traveling but also on air quality for people living in the area.

The group also highlighted the need to include pedestrian and bicycle analysis. Mr. Abbot and Mr. Peterson clarified that the modeling tools that will be used to do the analysis of scenarios in the project look at a more holistic picture, including alternate modes of transit.

Community growth projections for no-build:

Mr. Abbott presented an analysis of demographic growth projections and assumptions in the no-build scenario for communities in the study area through 2040. The analysis included 187 TAZs in the study area that will be affected going forward and accounted for growth in: population, various types of housing, household usage, employment, and total trips in each community. The 2030 and 2040 projections took into account Wynn Casino being built.

Group members discussed what they identified as a disconnect between sustainability and climate change-related policy prescriptions and goals and the current trend outlined in the no-build land use analysis. Group members discussed how the no-build analysis highlighted the need to plan for large increases in non-auto modeshare and employment and housing density near transit stations. Mr. Abbott affirmed that MassDOT had instructed the group that it did not have to stay within community control totals for future scenarios, though they were being used for the existing conditions and no-build analysis.

What is the problem we are trying to solve?

Group participants were asked to name and analyze the problem the group was working to solve, according to their individual or organizational perspectives. Group members offered a diverse range of perspectives including the following:

- We need to improve both Sullivan Square and the broader area without sacrificing either.
- In shorthand, one might say we are aiming for more development and fewer cars.
- This is a movement towards smart growth for the region and an opportunity to create a model plan.
- We aim to estimate and forecast transit improvements needed/alternative transit modeshare increase needed to have a functional balance of transit modes (especially concerning congestion on highways).
- We aim to mitigate adverse impacts of development on mobility.
- Investments and innovative methods are needed to address necessary infrastructure improvements.
- Less expensive policy prescriptions can address many development and mobility issues.
- We aim to develop an analytically rigorous assessment of what future development will require for transportation and mobility projects and make recommendations, but not implement or decide which projects to pursue specifically.
- We should go beyond planning in current transportation/planning paradigm to visioning for the future of the urban area.

Schedule review for 2016-17:

Mr. Abbott reviewed the technical schedule for the duration of the project with the group. The group provided feedback on the schedule, including suggestions of which scenarios to prioritize in the modeling process. Mr. Gillooly suggested that one of the early alternative scenarios could analyze Sullivan Square either with or without an underpass, assuming comparable development in either case, which could help inform the separate Sullivan Square/Rutherford Avenue study on its decision of which option to choose.

Public Engagement:

Mr. Field reported on the July 7 public engagement meeting and the next steps coming out of that meeting. He explained an emerging plan and solicited feedback from the group on the following proposal.

The public engagement process will make clear the study's focus on mobility and make clear for participants from the public where the opportunities to influence the process are. The process would begin with a public meeting in the fall which will be announced along with the launch of a public-facing website and online survey to gather feedback. The process would also include several invitation discussion groups to solicit feedback from key groups, especially those who might be underrepresented in participation in public meetings and the survey. There would also be a major workshop in spring 2017 to solicit more feedback from the public and present the results of some analysis of alternatives and leave time for feedback on the focus of a few remaining alternatives.

The group suggested linking the Lower Mystic engagement process with other planning public engagement efforts could help extend the breadth of feedback the group could get.

The group adjourned at 11:30.